

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are presented for consideration, with 1 being independent.

An editorial change has been made to the specification. In addition, the abstract has been replaced to better set forth technical features of the claimed invention. Lastly, the title has been amended to be more clearly indicative of the claimed invention.

In the claims, Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art, and editorial changes have been made to Claims 2 and 3. Claim 5 has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Mori '180. In addition, Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Mori, and Claim 3 is rejected as allegedly being obvious over Mori and further in view of Francis '411. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicant's invention relates to a display apparatus comprised of an electrophoretic display device having a plurality of pixels arranged in a matrix, with each pixel including charged particles in a dispersion liquid and a pair of electrodes disposed close to the dispersion liquid, and a position of the charged particles and the pixel providing a gradation, and a drive circuit for outputting a gradation signal to each pixel. The gradation of each pixel is influenced by gradation signals of adjacent pixels through an electric field interference between pixels. As amended, Claim 1 recites a correction circuit for correcting the gradation signal at each pixel to compensate for the influence from the gradation signals of the adjacent pixels.

Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, on page 6, line 12, *et. seq.*, of the specification. In accordance with Applicant's claimed invention, a high performance display apparatus can be provided.

The primary citation to Mori relates to a liquid crystal display device that includes a matrix of pixels and a drive circuit. In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, however, the Mori publication relates to a liquid crystal display and not to an electrophoretic display. Moreover, Mori does not teach or suggest, among other features, a correction circuit for correcting a gradation signal at each pixel to compensate for the influence from gradation signals of adjacent pixels. In Mori, a voltage applied to each pixel is corrected in order to reduce fluctuation in pixel potential for the purpose of suppressing cross talk (see paragraph 56, page 4).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are respectfully requested.

The secondary citation to Francis relates to an active matrix display and is relied upon for its teaching of a storing device. Francis fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Mori as discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of art, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 2-4 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM\rnm

FCHS_WS 2370860v1